

VZCZCXYZ0003  
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUEHGV #1204/01 3541408  
ZNY SSSSS ZZH  
O 201408Z DEC 09  
FM USMISSION GENEVA  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 0850  
RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/CJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/VCJCS WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/JOINT STAFF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHEHNSC/NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO IMMEDIATE 5916  
RHMFISS/DEPT OF ENERGY WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DTRA ALEX WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RUESDT/DTRA-OSSES DARMSTADT GE IMMEDIATE  
RUENAAA/CNO WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
RHMFISS/DIRSSP WASHINGTON DC IMMEDIATE  
INFO RUEHTA/AMEMBASSY ASTANA PRIORITY 3095  
RUEHKV/AMEMBASSY KYIV PRIORITY 2105  
RUEHMO/AMEMBASSY MOSCOW PRIORITY 7312

S E C R E T GENEVA 001204

SIPDIS

DEPT FOR T, VCI AND EUR/PRA  
DOE FOR NNSA/NA-24  
CIA FOR WINPAC  
JCS FOR J5/DDGSA  
SECDEF FOR OSD(P)/STRATCAP  
NAVY FOR CNO-N5JA AND DIRSSP  
AIRFORCE FOR HQ USAF/ASX AND ASXP  
DTRA FOR OP-OS OP-OSA AND DIRECTOR  
NSC FOR LOOK  
DIA FOR LEA

E.O. 12958: DECL: 12/19/2019  
TAGS: [KACT](#) [MARR](#) [PARM](#) [PREL](#) [RS](#) [US](#) [START](#)  
SUBJECT: START FOLLOW-ON NEGOTIATIONS, GENEVA  
(SFO-GVA-VII): (U) INSPECTION PROTOCOL WORKING GROUP  
MORNING MEETING, DECEMBER 10, 2009

REF: GENEVA 01091 (SFO-GVA-VII-063)

Classified By: A/S Rose E. Gottemoeller, United States  
START Negotiator. Reasons: 1.4(b) and (d).

11. (U) This is SFO-GVA-VII-119.

12. (U) Meeting Date: December 10, 2009  
Time: 10:00 A.M. - 1:00 P.M.  
Place: Russian Mission, Geneva

-----  
SUMMARY  
-----

13. (S) This meeting of the Inspection Protocol Working Group (IPWG), chaired by Secretary of Defense Representative Dr. Warner and Russian Ministry of Defense Representative Col Ilin, took place on December 10 and focused on issues remaining in treaty Article XI, and Section VIII on Exhibitions. For Article XI, the discussion dealt with defining "declared data," and the differences in approach over whether inspectors would look for additional items of inspection beyond those in the declared data. For Section VIII, the focus was on ensuring that the language would require exhibition of the RS-24, and which Party would pay for the costs of those exhibitions. End Summary.

14. (U) SUBJECT SUMMARY: Another Review of Treaty Article XI; Agreed Statements Status; The RS-24 Must Be Exhibited and More on Section VIII; and Who Pays for Exhibitions?

-----  
ANOTHER REVIEW OF TREATY ARTICLE XI  
-----

¶5. (S) The sides worked toward resolving an issue in treaty Article XI concerning the meaning of the term "declared data," which would also affect Part Five of the Protocol. Warner presented a draft definition for the term.

Begin text:

The term "declared data," with respect to the data the accuracy of which is confirmed during inspection activities, means:

(a) data with respect to items subject to the Treaty, listed according to categories of data in Part Two of this Protocol;

(b) data, provided through notifications pursuant to Part Four of this Protocol, that update the categories of data in Part Two of this Protocol;

(c) information on the technical characteristics of new types of strategic offensive arms provided through notifications, confirmed during exhibitions, and subsequently listed in Part Two of this Protocol; and

(d) information that the inspected Party provides to the inspection teams during pre-inspection procedures.

End text.

Ilin said the Russian side had also prepared a draft definition, but was not ready to hand it over to the U.S. side. Both Warner and Ilin agreed that the sides were close to finalizing the definition.

¶6. (S) Warner noted that the basic difference between the sides in treaty Article XI was that the U.S. side proposed to conduct inspections "at bases," while the Russian side proposed to conduct inspection "of items." This inferred that the Russian side might somehow try to limit inspector access on a base to only declared items, and that inspectors might not be allowed to inspect the base beyond that. Ilin did not directly reply.

¶7. (S) For paragraph 3 of Article XI, Warner noted that issues remained concerning the Russian-proposal to continue to include elimination inspections and periodic inspections of converted strategic offensive arms (SOA) as Type Two inspections.

-----  
AGREED STATEMENTS STATUS  
-----

¶8. (S) Warner and Ilin agreed to discuss draft Agreed Statements on the B-1B and the SSGN in addition to treaty Article XI later in the day. AMB Antonov had asked Ilin to be the chair from the Russian side of the group that would discuss the new agreed statements.

-----  
THE RS-24 MUST BE EXHIBITED AND MORE ON SECTION VIII  
-----

¶9. (S) Discussion moved to Exhibitions, Section VIII of Part Five of the Protocol. Warner noted that the U.S.-proposed text had added the words "variant" and "version" in paragraph 2 in order to require the RS-24 ICBM to be exhibited in a technical characteristics exhibition even if the RS-24 was declared as a new type during the interval between treaty signature and its entry-into-force (EIF). Ms. Pura described how a loophole could exist without the requirement to exhibit a new "variant" if, for instance, a B52-I were deployed. Warner explained how the SS-27 would not have had to be

exhibited if variants were not required to be exhibited. Warner said there was a need to ensure that the RS-24 could not fall into some sort of loophole if declared as a new type during this "gap" period, and he would have to check with legal advisors how provisional application of the treaty would deal with exhibition of a new type of ICBM as the treaty would not yet be ratified. Warner further noted that declaration of the deployment of the RS-24 as a new type in this "gap" interval would hurt the ratification process. Ilin said that no exhibitions could take place until after EIF, but that notifications would take place. Ilin complained that this was a walkback on agreed text. After consultation with Mr. Izrazov, Col Petrov and Col Zaitsev, Ilin relented and accepted the U.S. text.

¶10. (S) The sides agreed to restructure paragraph 2 of Section VIII to place the obligations and rights to perform such exhibitions in the opening sentence of the paragraph.

¶11. (S) The sides agreed to delete a U.S. proposal that initial exhibitions occur 15 days before the commencement of inspection activities.

¶12. (S) The sides agreed to use the verb "demonstrate" instead of "exhibit" in paragraph 3 of Section VIII, which was about the exhibition of the results of the conversion of the first item converted using new conversion procedures.

¶13. (S) Warner noted that paragraph 4 of Section VIII would remain bracketed. The U.S. side wanted the confirmation of conversions and eliminations to be an exhibition, while the Russian side wanted to make them to be a Type Two inspection and fall under the annual quota for Type Two inspections. Warner also repeated the U.S. position that there would be no exhibitions of missile defense interceptors as proposed by the Russian side.

-----  
WHO PAYS FOR EXHIBITIONS?  
-----

¶14. (S) Ilin proposed that the participating Party pay for its own costs associated with all exhibitions; financial constraints are a significant concern for Russia. He outlined three methods in which this could take place. The participating Party could pay on the spot for travel within the inspected country and for lodging, they could be billed on a per person basis, or the host could send an invoice to the inspecting country. Ilin suggested the details could be in an annex and would not need to be resolved prior to treaty signature. Warner mentioned the U.S. side was discussing a proposal where the participating Party would pay its own way for conversion and elimination confirmation exhibitions, and noted the Russian proposal would apply such provisions for all exhibitions. He questioned how equitable this proposal would be, as the bulk of elimination exhibitions during the 10 years of START Follow-on would likely be conducted by Russia.

¶15. (S) The discussions shifted to Section III of Part V of the Protocol. Ilin insisted that the inspecting Party pay for parking and security costs when travelling to and from the point of entry via military aircraft. The issue remained in brackets.

¶16. (S) The sides concluded the meeting with a review of the sections to be discussed. Warner noted that Annexes 6 and 7 needed to be addressed soon. Ilin said they could be worked out in the Bilateral Consultative Commission. Warner noted that A/S Gottemoeller and Antonov had already agreed that these two annexes should be completed prior to treaty signature.

¶17. (U) Documents provided

- UNITED STATES:

- Draft Definition for Declared Data

¶18. (U) Participants:

UNITED STATES

Dr. Warner  
Mr. Buttrick  
Mr. Coussa  
LTC Leyde  
Mr. McConnell  
Mr. Rust  
Mr. Sims  
Mr. Smith  
Ms. Gesse (Int)

RUSSIA

Col Ilin  
Mr. Izrazov  
Col Petrov  
Ms. Vodopolova  
Col Zaitsev  
Ms. Komshilova (Int)

¶19. (U) Gottemoeller sends.  
GRIFFITHS